

REMARKS:

Applicants are amending claims 1-3 and 5-10. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 5-12 currently are pending and are subject to examination in the above-captioned patent application. No new matter is added by the foregoing amendments, and these amendments are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Mendenhall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,381 B1, hereinafter "Mendenhall") in view of Normile et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,461,679, hereinafter "Normile"). To the extent that this rejection remains applicable in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as follows.

Applicants' independent claim 1 describes a MPEG video decoder comprising "a frame memory having a plurality of banks and connected to the image decoding section, wherein each of the banks has an area for storing the picture and the parameters obtained by the image decoding section, and stores the picture and the parameters by mutually relating the picture and the parameters as a set; . . . and a status register for storing values indicating whether display of the picture stored in the frame memory has finished, wherein the status register has an arbitration function for arbitrating between the decode control section and the display control section." Applicants' independent claim 9 includes corresponding method limitations.

The Examiner asserts that Normile discloses or suggests that each of the banks (job banks that are provided in a shared memory 405) has an area for storing the decoded picture and the decoded parameters, and that each of the banks stores the decoded picture and the decoded parameters as a set, as set forth in Applicants' independent claim 1 and 9. The Examiner also asserts that a status register of Normile has an arbitration function for arbitrating between the decode control section and the display control section. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions.

For example, in contrast to Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9, each of the job banks of the shared memory 405 of Normile stores "jobs" for individual slave modules, and each module pops the job from the shared memory 405 and processes the job, i.e., performs the decoding process, to obtain the stripe 602, 603, 604 or 605 of the original image 601. See, e.g., Normile, Column 12, Lines 45 and 46; and Figure 6. In other words, what is stored in the shared memory 405 of Normile is not the original image, but instead is a job for causing each module to reproduce a part of the original image. On the other hand, the frame memory as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9 stores the original image that was encoded into the MPEG bit stream and obtained by decoding the MPEG bit stream.

In addition, the shared memory 405 of Normile not only stores "jobs" in its job banks, but also stores certain data in its "mail box area for communication and task synchronization." *Id.* at Column 9, Lines 59-64. However, Normile does not disclose or suggest that the data stored in the mail box area is obtained by decoding the MPEG bit stream, and that the shared memory 405 stores the data and some other data as a set, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9.

Moreover, the status register(s) of Normile are registers for notifying the host 410 whether or not any one of the modules has posted a task for the host 410. See, e.g., Id. at Column 3, Lines 13-17. The values of the status register(s) of Normile indicate the presence or absence of the task for the host 410, but does not indicate whether or not the display of the picture stored in the frame memory has finished, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9. Although the arbitration mechanism 502 of Normile arbitrates accesses to the shared memory 405, Normile does not disclose or suggest that the arbitration mechanism 502 reads the status register(s) for the arbitration. In addition, the arbitration mechanism 502 performs the arbitration between the host 410 and the modules 401-404, not between the decode control section and the display control section, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9. See, e.g., Id. at Column 10, Lines 55-67; and Column 11, Lines 1-11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 at least for these reasons.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 10-12 depend from one of allowable, independent claims 1 and 9. Therefore Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also withdraw the obviousness rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 10-12 at least for this reason.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-captioned patent application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that an in-person or telephonic interview with Applicants' representatives would expedite the prosecution of the above-captioned patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of records. In the event of any variance between the fees determined by Applicants and those determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge or credit any such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 108391-00014.

Respectfully submitted,


Timothy J. Churna
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,340

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8434
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810

CMM/TJC:ksm